

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-37, 40-46, 48-50, 52-64, 71-72, and 93-154 are pending in the application upon entry of this amendment. Claims 95-154 are newly added. As further explained below, new independent claims 95 and 125 (and thus the related dependent claims) more broadly recite the claimed screens concept comparably as claimed when reference Dauerer was first applied by the Examiner several Office Actions ago. Applicant continues to disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that the prior art, and Dauerer in particular, teaches the claimed screens concept by which each one of the logically associated screens is individually selectable, and that the user may jump from the physically viewable area to a selected logical screen anywhere in the workspace.

The Examiner has misunderstood the claimed screens concept based upon previous versions of the claim language. Accordingly, claims 95 and 125 include additional clarification of the screens concept as compared to previous versions of the claims, reciting that the user can jump to a logical screen anywhere in the logical workspace, as compared to the prior art which merely teaches incremental movements across the workspace rather than jumps through the workspace.

In addition, independent claims 93 and 94, and dependent claims 23 and 59, have been amended simply to provide a minor clarification in view of a comment made by the Examiner as to the rejection of such claims. As also described further below, additional dependent claim features have been added relating to the storing and retrieval of a plurality of logical screen layouts for the main application workspace, and the storing and retrieval of a plurality of main application workspaces with each workspace having a different arrangement of logical screens.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is being submitted herewith to obtain entry and consideration of the current claim amendments. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the claim amendments and following remarks.

I. Patentability of New Independent Claims 95 and 125

A. Overview of the Screens Concept

Throughout prosecution, Applicant has maintained that the prior art does not teach the claimed screens concept, even in a broad sense. Although Applicant may have amended the claims to recite more specific features, the current claims are drawn to the broader screens concept, which is not taught by the prior art.

Under the claimed screens concept, a continuous logical main application workspace is made up of computer system display-sized logical screens that are individually selectable navigation units with exact predetermined locations within the continuous logical main application workspace. Navigation tools permit the user to jump from a current physically viewable work area to another area within the logical main application workspace by selecting a logical screen that is located anywhere within the workspace. The current physically viewable area can be anywhere within the logical main application workspace, and need not be located exactly over the boundaries of a predetermined logical screen. The screens concept has been clarified further in the current claim amendments, including the addition of new independent claims 95 and 125.

The screens concept features are described in the application, for example, at paragraphs [0058-0077] in relation to an exemplary screens layout as depicted in Fig. 3. Such portion of the application describes various ways for individually selecting a particular logical screen for navigation and “jumping” to a selected logical screen anywhere in the workspace. For example, an individual logical screen may be selected from a navigation box 84, and upon such selection the viewable area will jump in a “quantum” type display transition to the selected logical screen. (Application at paragraph [0058-0060].) As another example, an individual logical screen selection may be employed using a drop down menu, which results in a jump to the selected logical screen. (See Application at paragraphs [0065-0066].) By various ways, therefore, each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation within the logical main application workspace. Furthermore, the system jumps from a current physically viewable area to

a selected logical screen, the selected predetermined logical screen being located anywhere in the logical main application workspace. The result is an instant display change from a current physically viewable area to a display of the selected logical screen. The change always occurs by jumping to the selected screen, never by sliding or incremental moves. The jumps are from the current location over the logical main application workspace, skipping over intervening logical screens as necessary based on the particular screen selected by the user.

In accordance with such features, new independent claim 95 recites in part:

computer code that, by user action, jumps from the physically viewable area in the logical main application workspace to a selected one of the logical screens, the selected one of the logical screens being any logical screen in the logical main application workspace.

Comparable features are recited in new independent claim 125. The previously-pending independent claims also have been amended to recite comparable features, in addition to the more specific features that were discussed during the previous telephone interview with the Examiner.

B. Deficiencies of Dauerer As To the Broad Screens Concept

As in previous Office Actions, the Examiner cites to Dauerer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,841,435 (Dauerer), as allegedly disclosing the broad screens concept. Applicant disputes this interpretation of Dauerer.

1. Applicant teaches quantum movements such as jumping through the logical workspace (see Application at least at paragraphs [0058-0066] and [0076]). Applicant teaches, through user input, jumping from any point on the logical workspace exactly to any one of the ***predetermined*** logical screen locations on the logical main application workspace. In other words, Applicant teaches jumping directly from point to point, and over all points between the start and the end of the jump.

By contrast to jumping from point to point, Dauerer's teaching is restricted to incrementally ***moving across*** the virtual workspace from one area on the virtual workspace to an adjacent and contiguous area. Dauerer teaches (see col. 10, lines 14-

29) various methods of incrementally moving **across** the virtual desktop. More specifically, Dauerer teaches incrementally moving the physical display across the virtual workspace in one of two ways. Dauerer's moves are either continuous or discrete. One of the possible discrete moves is a move the size of the physical monitor.

Whether Dauerer's incremental moves are continuous or discrete, Dauerer teaches dragging the physical display **across the virtual workspace** from one contiguous location to another contiguous location. Therefore, ***Dauerer's moving across a virtual workspace is functionally not the same as Applicant's jumping through the virtual workspace.*** Although sometimes both methods cause the viewable area to end up at the same location on the workspace, Applicant and Dauerer get there using functionally different methods.

In contrast to Dauerer, the jumping movements as taught by Applicant are neither continuous nor discrete. Jumps are made by adaptively calculating how far the jump needs to take place in order to land exactly over the predetermined boundaries of the selected logical screen. Also, unlike Dauerer, the jumping is not restricted from one area that is contiguous to another area.

2. The jumps as taught in the current application are not made relative to the current location of the viewable area. Applicant teaches that the relative location of the current viewable area of the logical workspace has no bearing on the jumped-to location. The jumped-to location is ***always exactly*** to a predefined logical screen location on the logical workspace. As such, ***the starting point of a jump as taught by Applicant has no bearing on the ending point of a jump.***

By contrast, Dauerer's moves are made relative from a current location on the virtual workspace. The incremental moves, even in the case of a discrete incremental movement the size of the physical display, are moves relative to the current starting point location. As such, unless the physical display is currently located exactly over what would be equivalent to the exact predetermined location of a logical screen in the current application, the ending point of a move in Dauerer would not take it to an exact predefined location on the logical workspace. ***Since the ending point of a move in***

Dauerer is always relative to the starting point of a move, Dauerer could not possibly teach the claimed jumping through a logical workspace.

Although Dauerer at times may employ terms that are similar to terms of the current application, the concepts are very different. In Dauerer, the term “virtual” is associated with a “virtual windows desktop” and refers to an extended windows work area beyond the physical limitations of the system’s display device. Dauerer refers to this extended windows work area as a “virtual display area”. The virtual display area can contain other independent computer software applications located anywhere within the expanded windows work area. The part of the virtual display area that is visible to the user on the computer display is called the “physical display”. (See Dauerer Abstract.) The current application employs the term “logical main application workspace” to describe a logical workspace area that is larger than the area visible on a computer display, similar to the term “virtual display area” of Dauerer. Applicant further employs the term “physically viewable area” to denote the area visible on the computer display, similar to Dauerer’s “physical display”. Despite this use of terms to describe comparable portions of virtual the workspace, Dauerer does not teach the claimed screens concept.

The system of Dauerer, the base reference for all rejections, provides a virtual workspace larger than a viewable area. As depicted in Fig. 3 of Dauerer, the virtual workspace can be a multiple of a physical display 54 arranged in an “array”, such as the 3 x 3 array depicted in Fig. 3. (Dauerer at col. 4, lines 38-43.) The generation of a workspace based on multiples of a physical display bears some similarity to aspects of the claimed logical screens, and the Examiner indeed mistakenly equates the two. The nature of the purported screens of Dauerer, however, differs substantially from the nature of the claimed logical screens.

As stated above, independent claims 95 and 125 (as representative of all the independent claims) recite that each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation within the logical main application workspace. Independent claims 95 and 125 further recite jumping from the physically viewable area in the logical main

application workspace to a selected one of the logical screens, the selected one of the logical screens being any logical screen in the logical main application workspace.

The purported screens of Dauerer lack such features. Dauerer's principal usage of the concept of multiple display areas is in connection with the described "Define Virtual Area" function. Such function merely permits a user to initially define the workspace as a multiple of the physical display area. (Dauerer at col. 5, lines 32-46.) In contrast to the claimed invention, however, ***after the initial definition of the workspace the system of Dauerer does not employ a "screens" concept for navigating the workspace by individually selecting and jumping to a particular logical screen positioned anywhere within the logical main application workspace.***

Dauerer describes various ways for navigating ***across*** the workspace, including a "Move Physical Display Within Virtual Area" function, and a "Move Display Objects" function. (See, e.g., col. 6, lines 10-29; col. 7, lines 7-18.) No such functions employ a screens concept comparable to the claimed invention. Indeed, Figs. 4-12 of Dauerer, depicting the various navigation operations, ***all lack the grid of multiple display areas shown in Fig. 3 of Dauerer.*** For example, Fig. 6 of Dauerer, relied upon heavily by the Examiner, does not depict any arrangement in which the workspace is divided into logical screen sized units. Such grid of Fig. 3 of Dauerer is lacking from the depicted navigation mechanisms of the other figures because none of the various navigation mechanisms described by Dauerer relies upon a screens concept by which the screens are individually selectable for navigation, and by a jumping operation that can skip intervening screens.

Dauerer does not teach using the exact logical location of each of the logical screens on the virtual desktop as an integral part of navigating the virtual desktop. In contrast, in the claimed invention the exact predetermined location of each logical screen is an integral part of the navigation mechanism. All navigating with the claimed navigation tool is made by ***jumping exactly to one of these predetermined locations.*** In the current application, even in the instances in which the scroll bars or

mouse wheel have been used to move the viewing area away from an exact logical screen location, the subsequent jump is always made exactly to a predetermined location. Accordingly, in these above described instances a jump is made in less than an exact multiple of a logical screen size in order to move exactly to a predetermined location. Dauerer does not teach this type of movement to predetermined locations only. In Dauerer, where he teaches discrete movements they are not taught to move to previous exact logical screen locations. Although Dauerer does teach that a virtual desktop can be initially sized in multiples of the computer monitor, his teaching stops at that point. Dauerer, therefore, does not disclose any of the navigation mechanisms recited in independent claims 18, 54, 95 and 125.

The only navigation mechanism of Dauerer that is based on a display-sized area is the “Discreet Physical Display Movement” function, by which a movement equal to one physical display size may be employed using a pointer in either a vertical or horizontal direction from the current view. (See, e.g., Dauerer at col. 7, lines 32-42.) Even such navigation does not provide for individually selecting a logical screen located at any position within the workspace as claimed, nor jumping to the selected logical screen anywhere in the workspace as claimed. Dauerer at most merely permits adjacent movements across the workspace in display-sized increments.

In essence, ***in the claimed invention the end point of the jumping navigation is independent of the start point***, because the user can jump from the physically viewable area to a selected logical screen located anywhere in the workspace. The claimed invention thus permits quantum movements from any point in the workspace to any selected logical screen in the workspace. ***In contrast, in Dauerer the scope of potential end points is always dependent upon the start point because only adjacent movements can be made.***

For at least these reasons, Dauerer does not disclose or suggest the claim features that each logical screen is individually selectable for navigation within the logical main application workspace, and jumping from the physically viewable area in the logical main application workspace to a selected one of the logical screens, the

selected one of the logical screens being any logical screen in the logical main application workspace. Accordingly, Dauerer, does not disclose or suggest the invention as recited in independent claims 95 and 125 (and other independent claims reciting comparable features), and the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. The rejection of all claims, therefore, should be withdrawn insofar as Dauerer does not teach the claimed logical screens concept ***at all***.

II. Features Discussed During the Previous Telephone Interview

During the previous telephone interview on October 27, 2010, the Examiner identified three specific features of the invention that the Examiner had considered to be likely patentable. The Examiner has reconsidered the patentability of such features in the current Office Action. The Examiner's position during the telephone interview, however, was actually correct as to such features.

A. The Claimed Expansion of the Workspace

In response to the previous Office Action, and based on the telephone interview with the Examiner, independent claim 1 was amended to recite more specifically the automatic expansion of the workspace dimensions by moving a sub-application window outside the current dimensions of the workspace. In particular, independent computer-readable medium claim 1 was amended to recite:

computer code that logically associates a plurality of sub-application windows with respective logical screens within the logical main application workspace, the sub-application windows for displaying content of at least one open sub-application, and that automatically increases the number of logical screens in response to a user action to move one of the sub-application windows to a new location outside current dimensions of the continuous logical main application workspace.

Comparable features are recited in independent method claim 37.

Independent claims 1 and 37 (and associated dependent claims) stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dauerer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,841,435 (Dauerer), in view of Stuple et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,577,914 (Stuple). Stuple is a newly cited reference.

The Examiner states: “Dauerer fails to expressly teach automatically increasing **the number of logical screens** in response to a user action to moving a sub-application window outside the workspace.” The Examiner also states: “However, Stuple teaches automatically increasing **the size of the workspace** in response to data moving outside the workspace (see abstract).” (Office Action at page 4.) On the face of the Examiner’s consecutive statements, Stuple does not make up for the recognized deficiencies of Dauerer. Dauerer does not teach any basis for increasing the size of the workspace **by moving content at all**. In addition, even if Stuple is assumed to disclose the expansion of the size of the workspace by moving data (which as shown below it does not), the combined references still would not teach to increase **the number of logical screens** as claimed. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 37 are non-obvious on this basis alone.

Stuple does not teach expanding a workspace at all. A computer aided keyword search of Stuple shows that **there is no reference anywhere in the patent to the terms “virtual”, “logical” or “expanded” associated with the concepts of a computer work area, desktop, or workspace**. The computer-generated workspace contemplated by Stuple has nothing to do with the different concepts of the virtual desktop as described in Dauerer and the logical main application workspace as described in the current application. Reference to both the drawings and text in Stuple makes this point very clear—the workspace Stuple refers to merely is the workspace contained **within a software application**.

Stuple describes the resizing of the window of what is commonly referred to by those of ordinary skill in the art as a Single Document Interface (SDI). The computer generated workspace that is automatically resized is described in Stuple as the workspace that is left over on a computer display that is available to be shown in the window of a software application. This workspace is calculated after subtracting from the computer display area the areas required to show the graphical user interface items. (See Stuple at col. 7, line 56 to col. 8, line 9.)

Stuple’s only purported improvement over a conventional SDI is the described

manipulation of the scroll bars. The Examiner seems to be misinterpreting the use and definition of the word “workspace” within Stuple, as contrasted to the use of the definition of the word “workspace” within the current application. The workspace that Stuple describes is totally contained within an SDI. An SDI cannot contain another SDI. By contrast, the term “workspace” as described in the current application is a space that can contain any number of SDIs (such as none, one or numerous separate SDIs). Stuple does not organize multiple computer application objects. Except for the fact that the scroll bars in Stuple automatically appear and disappear depending upon the amount of data in the window of the application, Stuple is otherwise comparable to any conventional SDI.

Accordingly, recognizing that Stuple is for the most part a conventional SDI, Stuple does not teach increasing the size of the workspace in response to data moving outside the workspace as asserted by the Examiner. Rather, moving data in Stuple resizes the **display** of the workspace, not the size of the **workspace itself**. The Examiner only cites to the Abstract of Stuple, which states: “If data is entered outside the **displayed workspace**, scroll bars are then displayed to indicate the presence of content outside the **displayed workspace**.” In other words, if there is data in the workspace that is not seen in the display, scroll bars are added to permit the user to scroll to the unseen data. The size of the available workspace, however, is not altered.

A more detailed review of the specification of Stuple supports Applicant’s argument. The available workspace in Stuple may exceed the display size: “a user may use the available workspace in a similar fashion as the user would use an infinitely size sheet of paper on which the user is making notes. **The user is not confined by any particular workspace size based on predetermined page sizes or margins.**” (Stuple at col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 3, emphasis added.) Stuple goes on: Likewise, the user may add data above, below or left of the **displayed workspace**.” When data is outside the displayed workspace, scroll bars are added to indicate there is unseen data. (Stuple at col. 6, lines 5-15.) Again, it is the display that changes, and not the size of the available workspace.

The thrust of Stuple's teachings is to provide an enhanced user experience in the manner of display of the workspace: "The workspace is displayed without the use of scroll bars to create a user experience that the displayed workspace is the total available workspace." (Stuple at col. 2, lines 20-24). To accomplish this, Stuple does not resize the workspace available to an application. Rather, Stuple resizes the **displayed workspace, which is the workspace available to the display. This is distinctly different from resizing the workspace available to an application.** Stuple makes a clear distinction between the displayed workspace and the total workspace available to the user. (See Stuple at col 5, lines 46-50.) Stuple teaches that in order to create this enhanced user experience, if the calculated displayed workspace area on the physical monitor is not large enough to display the application data without scroll bars, then scroll bars are added.

As described in Stuple, his invention is particularly suitable when data must be transferred between display devices having different sizes. For example, when data is transferred from a large display device to a relatively small display device, the display of the second device does not squeeze all the data into the smaller display size. Rather, the **workspace dimensions** stay the same and the **display dimensions** conform to the second display device. Because the display dimensions of the second display device are smaller, some of the data will be unseen on the second display device. The scroll bars, therefore, are added to the display as an indication that unseen data is present. With such system: "the total available workspace . . . may be any size desired by the user and may be displayed to the user only limited by the size of the display screen on which it is displayed." (Stuple at col. 6, lines 13-26.)

In Stuple, therefore, the movement of data is related only to the display of the workspace, but is not determinative of the size of the workspace outside of the display. In addition, as stated above, there is no disclosure or suggestion anywhere in Stuple that the movement of data can result in increasing the **number of logical screens** in the workspace.

As understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, a typical SDI always has at least one scroll bar visible, and the scroll bar is visible even in the instance when no data has been entered into the workspace. Stuple teaches a variation of this standard SDI. Stuple makes a scroll bar visible only if the data in the workspace causes the actual workspace to exceed the displayed available workspace. ***Given that Stuple does not teach expanding the workspace at all, it follows that Stuple does not teach expanding the workspace by increasing a number of logical screens.***

Stuple merely teaches the incremental resizing of the application space as data is entered via user input, resizing the application space just enough to hold the last data point, but no larger. Stuple adds scroll bars if necessary to indicate the presence of undisplayed data off-screen. In contrast, the claimed invention recites automatically expanding the logical main application workspace by increasing the number of logical screens, and not incrementally as data is added as taught in Stuple.

In addition, Stuple does not teach dragging a sub-application window to resize a workspace. Stuple only teaches entering text or data by user input. There is no relationship between dragging a sub-application window as claimed to expand the logical main application workspace, versus the entering of text or data to resize a display window as taught in Stuple.

Furthermore, the application window described in Stuple (as in any SDI) cannot contain sub-applications. Such application windows only contain data. ***Since an SDI cannot contain a sub-application window, Stuple cannot teach dragging a sub-application window to automatically increase the size of a logical main application workspace in logical screen sized increments as claimed.***

For these reasons, a combination of Dauerer and Stuple does not result in, disclose, or suggest the features recited in independent claims 1 and 37 pertaining to the expansion of the workspace by increasing the number of logical screens based on movement of a sub-application window. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 37 are not obvious over Dauerer in view of Stuple, and the related dependent claims are

patentable for at least the same reasons. The rejection of these claims, therefore, should be withdrawn.

B. Display Features of the Claimed Navigation Box

In response to the previous Office Action, and based on the telephone interview with the Examiner, independent claims 18 and 54 were amended to clarify that a navigation box is provided that represents in miniature form the entire logical main application workspace. The navigation box is employed to jump the physically viewable work area from one area of the logical main application workspace to a logical screen selected from the navigation box. In addition, as clarified in the current claim amendments, the navigation box is displayed simultaneously with the physically viewable work area in the logical main application workspace. As describing a navigation box, independent computer-readable medium claim 18 recites a “navigation box that includes a representation of the continuous logical main application workspace including ***an indication of each logical screen within the workspace.***” Comparable features are cited in independent method claim 54.

Independent claims 18 and 54 (and associated dependent claims) stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dauerer in view of Anderson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0189597 (Anderson). Anderson also has been cited in previous Office Actions. One of ordinary skill in the art would not combine Dauerer and Anderson in the manner asserted by the Examiner.

The Examiner relies on Dauerer at col. 6, lines 20-29 as disclosing a navigation box. The Examiner equates the “reduced virtual display 52” to the claimed navigation box. The reduced virtual display 52 actually is described in more detail in Dauerer at col. 5, lines 47-62, as depicted in Fig. 6. The reduced virtual display 52 of Dauerer differs from the navigation box as recited in independent claims 18 and 54. The reduced virtual display 52 of Dauerer does not contain ***an indication of each logical screen*** as claimed. For example, Dauerer Fig. 6 lacks a grid of the purported screens as contained in Dauerer Fig. 3. In contrast, the navigation box 84 of Applicant’s system contains an indication of each logical screen S1-S9. (See, e.g., Application Fig. 7.)

Indeed, in the system of Dauerer the reduced virtual display 52 *is* the physically viewable work area. It is simply a “reduced resolution application window to improve the display performance” (Dauerer at col 5, lines 56-57). Accordingly, the reduced virtual display of Dauerer is not a navigation box displayed in combination with the physically viewable work area as in the claimed invention. **Furthermore, Dauerer’s reduced virtual display has no functionality.** Dauerer does not teach clicking on the reduced virtual display to jump to other areas of the virtual desktop. In order to move to another part of the virtual desktop, the user of Dauerer has to move the reduced virtual display across the virtual workspace. Dauerer also does not teach dragging a sub-application from one area of the virtual desktop to another area of the virtual desktop utilizing the reduced virtual display.

The Examiner asserts Anderson teaches to modify Dauerer to provide a navigation box displayed in combination with the content of a displayed screen. There is no basis in the references to do so, particularly because Anderson does not pertain to a continuous logical application workspace at all. Although Anderson describes a Virtual Desktop Manager, the term “virtual” refers to a desktop that allows the grouping of application windows. (Anderson at col. 1, lines 40-44.) Each user defined grouping can be saved as a separate “virtual desktop.” **Anderson states that “Each virtual desktop has the same size as the desktop.”** (Anderson at col. 1, lines 41-41.) Accordingly, Anderson does not disclose or suggest an expanded work area larger than the computer display. Anderson’s virtual desktop manager simply deals with aspects of saving, restoring and switching between multiple virtual desktops. **These desktops exist independent of each other, are not contiguous, and are not larger than an area of the computer display, or the standard sized desktop in the Windows operating system.**

In particular, the Examiner asserts Anderson discloses a navigation box (virtual desktop manager 400) that is displayed in conjunction with one of the desktops (see Anderson Fig. 11). Because the desktops of Anderson do not form a continuous workspace, the virtual desktop manager permits a user to select between desktops.

These features do not teach one to display a navigation box of a continuous logical application workspace in conjunction with a screen-sized viewable area of such workspace. As shown above, the purported navigation box of Dauerer Fig. 6 spans the entire viewable work area and does not indicate the specific screens. One of ordinary skill in art would not modify Dauerer based on Anderson, which ***merely teaches selecting from different desktops that do not form a logical application workspace.***

For these reasons, a combination of Dauerer and Anderson does not result in, disclose, or suggest the features recited in independent claims 18 and 54 pertaining to the simultaneous display of a navigation box with the physically viewable area in the logical main application workspace. Accordingly, independent claims 18 and 54 are not obvious over Dauerer in view of Anderson, and the related dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. The rejection of these claims, therefore, should be withdrawn.

C. Movement of Sub-application Windows With the Navigation Box

In response to the previous Office Action, and based on the telephone interview with the Examiner, independent claims 93 and 94 were added to recite a more specific usage of the navigation box. Comparable features are recited in dependent claims 23 and 59, and new dependent claims 118 and 148. In particular, a user selected sub-application window may be moved from one logical screen to another logical screen with which the sub-application window becomes associated, without changing the display of the currently displayed area of the logical main application workspace. In particular, the sub-application may be moved to and associated with another logical screen by moving an iconic representation of the user selected sub-application window in the navigation box. Because the manipulation is made solely via the navigation box, sub-application windows may be moved between logical screens without altering the display of the area of the logical main application workspace being viewed in the physically viewable work area.

During the telephone interview, the Examiner had agreed such features were not taught by the cited references of Dauerer and Anderson. The Examiner, however, now asserts Dauerer teaches such features, apparently oppositely to the Examiner's position during the telephone interview. In the current Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed sub-application window being moved is not necessarily the sub-application window that the user previously selected. (See Final Office Action at page 14.) It seems this alleged claim ambiguity is the basis for the Examiner's reconsideration of the patentability of the features of independent claims 93 and 94 (and similar features in dependent claims 23 and 59, and 118 and 148).

In accordance with the Examiner's comments, these claims have been clarified simply to recite that the sub-application being moved is indeed the **user selected** sub-application window. Dauerer does not teach such features, as discussed during the telephone interview. Again, the Examiner considers Fig. 6 of Dauerer to be a "navigation box," but in such embodiment the entire virtual work area is displayed in a reduced manner. Fig. 6 of Dauerer, therefore, does not represent a display of one of the logical screens. Relatedly, because the purported navigation box in Dauerer spans the entire display area, **it is impossible** in Dauerer to move a sub-application window "without changing the display of the currently displayed logical screen within the physically viewable work area" as claimed.

In addition, although not relied upon by the Examiner as to these features, Anderson does not teach these deficiencies of Dauerer. In Anderson, there is no continuous workspace larger than a viewable work area, but rather a user may select distinct desktops that do not form a singular logical workspace. One, therefore, cannot move a sub-application from one desktop to another desktop **at all**.

For these reasons, a combination of Dauerer and Anderson does not result in, disclose, or suggest the features recited in independent claims 93 and 94 (and dependent claims 23 and 59, and 118 and 148) pertaining to using the navigation box to move a user selected sub-application window between logical screens without changing the display of the currently displayed area of the logical main application

workspace. Accordingly, independent claims 93 and 94 are not obvious over Dauerer in view of Anderson, and the related dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. The rejection of these claims, therefore, should be withdrawn.

III. New Dependent Claims Features

New dependent claims have been added pertaining to the storage and retrieval of multiple logical screen layouts for a logical main application workspace, and multiple logical main application workspaces with each having a different arrangement of logical screens. (See new claims 101-102, 120-122, 150-152, and 154.) (See, e.g., Application at paragraph [0043].) The cited references do not disclose or suggest storing and retrieving a plurality of logical **screen-based** layouts of a logical main application workspace, and/or a plurality of main application workspaces that each have a different arrangement of logical screens.

In addition, new claim 119 recites: “the selected screen does not contain any sub-application windows.” Comparable features are recited in new claims 123, 149, and 153. Such claims clarify that the ability to select a logical screen does not depend on the presence of a sub-application window within the selected logical screen. (See, e.g., Application at paragraph [0046]; Fig. 3.) The cited references, and Dauerer in particular (which the Examiner alleges teaches the screens concept), do not disclose or suggest such features.

The claimed invention, therefore, also recites the ability to create a logical main application workspace of any size absent of any sub-applications within the logical workspace, and then how to navigate anywhere within the workspace. This main application workspace can be created absent of having any sub-applications open anywhere in its workspace.

Applicant teaches creating a logical main application workspace then allowing the user to navigate by jumping to any desired predetermined logical screen location whether empty of sub-applications or not. The user can then open one or more sub-applications in the logical screen area. The user can repeat this as desired by navigating to another logical screen and opening other sub-applications.

Applicant, unlike Dauerer, does not put any restrictions on navigating only to those areas of the logical workspace containing computer application objects. Applicant allows moving of the viewing pane anywhere on the workspace whether or not a sub-application is open. By contrast Dauerer places restrictions and limits movement to only those areas where at least one application is located. (See "locating the physical display at a position corresponding to at least one of the application objects on the virtual display" (Dauerer at col 3, lines 3-5).)

As such, Dauerer's limitation places a severe restriction on the functionality of the workspace; therefore Dauerer could not have taught one of ordinary skill in the art how to create a logical main application workspace of any size absent of any sub-applications within the logical workspace. As demonstrated above, the claimed screens concept permits a user to navigate by jumping to any selected logical screen location, whether empty of sub-applications or not. The user can then open one or more sub-applications in the logical screen area. (See application at paragraphs [0044-0046]; Fig. 3.) The user can repeat this as desired by navigating to another logical screen and opening other sub-applications. Alternatively, the user can navigate to an empty logical screen, or a populated logical screen, and by using the navigational box (as described above) drag icon representations of any open sub-applications open elsewhere on the main logical workspace to that logical screen. ***This functionality gives the user the ability to create a palette of empty logical screens and populate it with sub-applications as desired.*** The powerfulness of this tool can be fully appreciated by anyone skilled in the art. The restrictions imposed in the system of Dauerer preclude any such navigation operations.

The new dependent claim features each depend from an independent claim, and therefore the new dependent claim features are patentable at least for the reasons set forth in the previous Sections I-II. The new dependent claim features are patentable for the additional reasons set forth in this Section III as well.

IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 4-10, 12-14, 16-28, 35-37, 40-46, 48-50, 52-64, 71-72, and 93-154 are allowable, and the application is in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988, Reference No. CUTCP0103US.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By /Lawrence S. Drasner/
Lawrence S. Drasner; Reg. No. 38,127

DATE: September 13, 2011

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
Telephone: (216) 621-1113
Facsimile: (216) 621-6165